# 1NC

### 1-Util Negates

Consequentialism means you negate. The resolution questions what just governments ought to do so if consequentialism is incapable of requiring something or fails to guide action, then a just government ought not require employers pay a living wage.

Every consequence causes another consequence so there are an infinite number of consequences for any given action. This means either A. every action has equal moral status because a fraction of infinity is still infinity, B. Calculation causes paralysis because it’s impossible to keep counting to infinity.

And, the universe has a flat topology which undermines consequentialist calculation. All actions would have equal and infinite value.

Bostrom Nick “Are Cosmological Theories Compatible with All Possible Evidence: A Missing Methodological Link” 2002

In the standard Big Bang model, assuming the simplest topology (i.e., that space is singly connected), there are three basic possibilities: the universe can be open, flat, or closed. Current data suggests a flat or open universe, although the final verdict is pending. If the universe is either open or flat, then it is spatially infinite at every point in time and the model entails that it contains an infinite number of galaxies, stars, and planets. There exists a common misconception which confuses the universe with the (finite) ‘observable universe’. But the observable part—the part that could causally affect us—would be just an infinitesimal fraction of the whole. Statements about the “mass of the universe” or the “number of protons in the universe” generally refer to the content of this observable part; see e.g. [1]. Many cosmologists believe that our universe is just one in an infinite ensemble of universes (a multiverse), and this adds to the probability that the world is canonically infinite; for a popular review, see [2].” Recent cosmological evidence suggests that the world is probably infinite. Moreover, if the totality of physical existence is indeed infinite, in the kind of way that modern cosmology suggests it is, then it contains an infinite number of galaxies, stars, and planets. If there are an infinite number of planets then **there is, with probability one, an infinite number of people.** Infinitely many of these people are happy, infinitely many are unhappy. Likewise for other local properties that are plausible candidates for having value, pertaining to person‐states, lives, or entire societies, ecosystems, or civilizations—there are infinitely many democratic states, and infinitely many that are ruled by despots, etc.  Suppose the world contains an infinite number of people and a corresponding infinity of joys and sorrows, preference satisfactions and frustrations, instances of virtue and depravation, and other such local phenomena at least some of which have positive or negative value. More precisely, suppose that there is some finite value ε such that there exists an infinite number of local phenomena (this could be a subset of e.g. persons, experiences, characters, virtuous acts, lives, relationships, civilizations, or ecosystems) each of which has a value ≥ ε and also an infinite number of local phenomena each of which has a value ≤ (‒ ε). Call such a world canonically infinite. Ethical theories that hold that value is aggregative imply that a canonically infinite world contains an infinite quantity of positive value and an infinite quantity of negative value. This gives rise to a peculiar predicament. We can do only a finite amount of good or bad. Yet in cardinal arithmetic, **adding** or subtracting **a finite quantity does not change an infinite quantity.** Every possible act of ours therefore has the same net effect on the total amount of good and bad in a canonically infinite world: none whatsoever. Aggregative consequentialist theories threatened by infinitarian paralysis: they seem to imply that if the world is canonically infinite then it is **always** ethically **indifferent what we do.**

Universe is flat and infinite.

NASA 14 National Aeronautics and Space Administration. “Will the Universe expand forever?” 24 January 2014. <http://map.gsfc.nasa.gov/universe/uni_shape.html>

The fate of the universe is determined by a struggle between the momentum of expansion and the pull of gravity. The rate of expansion is expressed by the Hubble Constant, Ho, while the strength of gravity depends on the density and pressure of the matter in the universe. If the pressure of the matter is low, as is the case with most forms of matter of which we know, then the fate of the universe is governed by the density. If the density of the universe is less than the "critical density", which is proportional to the square of the Hubble constant, then the universe will expand forever. If the density of the universe is greater than the "critical density", then gravity will eventually win and the universe will collapse back on itself, the so called "Big Crunch". However, the results of the WMAP mission and observations of distant supernova have suggested that the expansion of the universe is actually accelerating, which implies the existence of a form of matter with a strong negative pressure, such as the cosmological constant. This strange form of matter is also sometimes referred to as "dark energy". If dark energy in fact plays a significant role in the evolution of the universe, then in all likelihood the universe will continue to expand forever. INFINITE UNIVERSE? Possible space curvatures of the universe: Closed, Flat, Open The density of the universe also determines its geometry. If the density of the universe exceeds the critical density, then the geometry of space is closed and positively curved like the surface of a sphere. This implies that initially parallel photon paths converge slowly, eventually cross, and return back to their starting point (if the universe lasts long enough). If the density of the universe is less than the critical density, then the geometry of space is open (infinite), and negatively curved like the surface of a saddle. If the density of the universe exactly equals the critical density, then the geometry of the universe is flat like a sheet of paper, and infinite in extent. The simplest version of the inflationary theory, an extension of the Big Bang theory, predicts that the density of the universe is very close to the critical density, and that the geometry of the universe is flat, like a sheet of paper. MEASUREMENTS FROM WMAP The WMAP spacecraft can measure the basic parameters of the Big Bang theory including the geometry of the universe. If the universe were flat, the brightest microwave background fluctuations (or "spots") would be about one degree across. If the universe were open, the spots would be less than one degree across. If the universe were closed, the brightest spots would be greater than one degree across. Recent measurements (c. 2001) by a number of ground-based and balloon-based experiments, including MAT/TOCO, Boomerang, Maxima, and DASI, have shown that the brightest spots are about 1 degree across. Thus the universe was known to be flat to within about 15% accuracy prior to the WMAP results. WMAP has confirmed this result with very high accuracy and precision. We now know (as of 2013) that the universe is flat with only a 0.4% margin of error. This suggests that the Universe is infinite in extent; however, since the Universe has a finite age, we can only observe a finite volume of the Universe. All we can truly conclude is that the Universe is much larger than the volume we can directly observe.

### 2-India DA

India has potential to be a strong manufacturing power because of cheap labor. Cheap labor is why India will outpace China.

Einhorn 14 Bruce Einhorn (sia regional editor in Bloomberg Businessweek’s Hong Kong bureau. He was previously the Asia technology correspondent. Einhorn joined BusinessWeek as a Taiwan stringer in 1993. Prior to BusinessWeek, Einhorn was a Taiwan stringer for the Los Angeles Times, the Asian Wall Street Journal, and Journal of Commerce. Einhorn is a graduate of Princeton University. In 1996 and 1998 he received the Overseas Press Club’s Morton Frank Award for the best business reporting from abroad). “India vs. China: The Battle for Global Manufacturing.” Bloomberg Businessweek. November 6th, 2014. http://www.businessweek.com/articles/2014-11-06/india-vs-dot-china-the-battle-for-global-manufacturing

With its chronic blackouts, crumbling roads, and other infrastructure woes, India should have no appeal for John Ginascol. A vice president at Abbott Laboratories (ABT), Ginascol is responsible for ensuring that the company’s food-products factories run smoothly worldwide. He can’t afford surprises when it comes to electricity, water, and other essentials. “People like me,” he says, “dream of having existing, good, reliable infrastructure.” Yet Abbott has just opened its first plant in India, and Ginascol says there haven’t been any nightmares so far. In October the company began production at a $75 million factory in an industrial park in the western state of Gujarat. The factory is producing Similac baby formula and nutritional supplement PediaSure, which Abbott plans to sell to the growing Indian middle class. The plant will employ about 400 workers by the time it’s fully up and running next year. As for India’s infrastructure, Ginascol has no complaints. The officials in charge of the park “were able to deliver very good, very reliable power, water, natural gas, and roads,” he says. “Fundamentally, the infrastructure was in place.” **Indian Prime Minister** Narendra **Modi is hoping** other **executives will be** similarly **impressed with** the **ease of manufacturing in his country**. Before Modi took charge in New Delhi, he headed the state government in Gujarat, and during his 13 years in power there he made the state an industrial leader. Manufacturing accounts for 28 percent of Gujarat’s economy, compared with 13 percent for the country as a whole, and a touch less than the 30 percent figure for manufacturing titan China. Story: Why Factory Jobs Are Shrinking Everywhere In an attempt to build India’s industrial base nationwide, Modi is pushing the Make in India campaign, designed to attract foreign investment by highlighting the ongoing changes. “We have to increase manufacturing and ensure that the benefits reach the youth of our nation,” Modi tweeted after the initiative’s Sept. 25 introduction. By now he’s eased restrictions on foreign investment in property projects and begun an overhaul of the railroad system. In the year ahead **the prime minister’s campaign may gain momentum, thanks to** the **shifting fortunes of India and** its neighbor **China. The Indian economy**, which slumped badly in 2012 and 2013, **will likely grow** 6.3 percent next year, **in part because of investor confidence in Modi. By 2016 the** country’s **growth rate** of 7.2 percent **will surpass China**’s 7.1 percent, says CLSA senior economist Rajeev Malik. Well before the arrival of Modi, Indian leaders had talked about promoting manufacturing. The slowdown in China, however, could make a big difference this time. **China became an export powerhouse because of** its vast pool of **low-wage workers, but it’s no longer** so **cheap** to manufacture **there. Pinched by double-digit increases in China’s minimum wages, many companies are looking for low-cost alternatives**. Southeast Asian countries such as Vietnam and Indonesia are attractive, but they lack the deep supply of workers available in India. “It’s the only country that has the scale to take up where China is leaving off,” says Frederic Neumann, a senior economist with HSBC (HSBC). Vietnam and Indonesia? “Neither one is big enough to take up the slack,” he says**, leaving India with a “golden opportunity.”**

Raising minimum wage kills Indian competitiveness. Cheap labor is the only way to save India.

Pocha 14 Jehangir S. Pocha (Editor-in-chief of NewsX, India) “The Price of Sweat: America's Minimum Wage Debate Echoes in India” April 17th 2014 The World Post http://www.huffingtonpost.com/jehangir-s-pocha/america-wage-india\_b\_5168110.html

Businessmen and professionals celebrating the benefits of reforms with unbridled ambition and ostentation may pat themselves on the back for being India's wealth creators. But beyond the raucous Bollywood songs that have become the anthems of this ebullient generation, there is a total denial of the fact that it is India's under-paid, under-skilled and under-appreciated workers who are carrying the economy on their shoulders. The hard fact is that there is hardly a single Indian company that would be globally competitive if it paid global wages. With India's costs of power, land, capital, transport and logistics and technology being among the world's highest, businesses see cheap labor as the easiest way to be competitive. Developing the efficiencies and innovation in design, business processes and technology that create real global competitiveness is beyond the grasp of most Indian businesses.

Indian manufacturing has momentum and is key to India’s economic growth.

The Economist 12 The Economist. “The masala Mittelstand.” August 11th, 2012. http://www.economist.com/node/21560263

IF INDIA is to become “the next China”—a manufacturing powerhouse—it is taking its time about it. “We have to industrialise India, and as rapidly as possible,” said the country’s first prime minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, in 1951. Politicians have tried everything since, including Soviet-style planning. But India seems to prefer growing crops and selling services to making things you can drop on your foot. In this section Manufacturing is still just 15% of output (see chart), far below Asian norms. **India needs a big manufacturing base. No major country has grown rich without one and nothing else is likely to absorb the labour of** the 250m **youngsters set to reach working age in the next 15 years**. But it can seem a remote prospect. In July power cuts plunged an area in which over 600m people live into darkness, reminding investors that India’s infrastructure is not wholly reliable. And workers boiled over at a car factory run by Maruti Suzuki. Almost 100 people were injured and the plant was torched. The charred body of a human-resources chief was found in the ashes. Yet not all is farce and tragedy. Take Pune in west India, a booming industrial hub that has won the steely hearts of Germany’s car firms. Inside a $700m Volkswagen plant on the city’s outskirts, laser-wielding robots test car frames’ dimensions and a giant conveyor belt slips by, with sprung-wood surfaces to protect workers’ knees. It is “probably the cheapest factory we have worldwide”, says John Chacko, VW’s boss in India. In time it could become an export hub. Nearby, in the distance it takes a Polo to get to 60mph, is a plant owned by Mercedes-Benz. Both German firms were attracted by (fairly) reliable power and access to land but also Pune’s engineering colleges and tradition of manufacturing. “It is a hub for auto-suppliers,” says Peter Honegg, Mercedes’s boss. Smaller firms are arriving too. Zubin Kabraji, of the Indo-German chamber of commerce, says Pune hosts 262 German companies, up from 130-odd in 2008. The foreign influx is not limited to Germans; and local suppliers benefit regardless. Three-quarters of VW’s parts are bought locally. Some foreigners are not really manufacturing but rather assembling imported parts to get around Indian customs duties. Still they use some Indian suppliers too—30-40% of Mercedes’s components are local. Indian champions are also prospering. Tata, a conglomerate, has been in Pune for decades and has a new plant assembling Land Rover cars. Bharat Forge, with $1.3 billion of sales, makes car parts, with 70% going abroad. Its boss, B.N. Kalyani, says local entrepreneurs are “doing a damn good job”. **Industrial hotspots such as Pune, Chennai and** the state of **Gujarat are not the only ev**idence **that manufacturing has momentum. India’s share of global merchandise exports has doubled to 1.5% since 2000** (but is still far below China’s 11%)

Continued growth is the only way to solve poverty. It’s also key to US-India relations.

Schaffer 13 Teresita Schaffer (Nonresident Senior Fellow, Foreign Policy, The India Project). “India’s Sagging Economy—Strategic Consequences.” September 23rd, 2013. http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2013/09/23-india-economy-schaffer

The story of the Indian economy’s fall from grace is by now familiar – almost a new cliché. After three years of 9 percent growth, **India’s economy has sharply slowed**. Projections for 2014 range from 4 to 5.5 percent; Paribas bank estimates growth during the April-June 2013 quarter at 3.7 percent. **Manufacturing growth**, which had done well during the boom years, sank to 3.5 percent in 2011 and **barely topped 3 percent in 2012**. Perhaps the biggest attention-getter has been the plummeting value of the rupee, down 22 percent between May and September 2013, Rs. 63 to the dollar in mid-September. The picture is not all bleak. Services, accounting for about 59 percent of the Indian economy, grew over 7 percent – below the double digit levels of the past two decades, but still ahead of GDP, and some decline in services growth was widely expected. Domestic capital investment remains relatively high by international standards, though it did fall from a high of 38 percent of GDP in 2007/08 to 35.4 percent in 2011/12. International trade has held up better – exports and imports came close to doubling in the five years since 2007. Incoming investment has zigzagged. And undergirding all of this is the fact that private economic activity has been steadily expanding as a share of the economy for twenty years or more. Two decades ago, India’s economic travails would have been greeted with hand-wringing and a sense of the inevitable. Today, the reaction is different. **Indian decision-makers** and policy elites **recognize that economic dynamism is** not just **a prerequisite for bringing prosperity to India’s poor**, but also a strategic asset – or liability. And around the world, **India’s economic performance is seen as a prime indicator of its capacity to shape** regional and **global events**. The government clearly understands that it needs to turn the economy around. In the past couple of months, Finance Minister P. Chidambaram has pushed through some measures intended to bring in more foreign investment and improve relations with international business. These included the suspension of the Indian government’s policy on “preferential market access” (local content requirements) for electronic equipment purchased by the government. The government also revised and moved to implement its decision to open single-brand retail to foreign investment. Unfortunately, to sell this measure politically, the government surrounded it with conditions that have kept investors away. None had signed on as of mid-September; the government is working hard to bring in at least one of the major retailers. In other indications of a push to revive the economy, the Foreign Investment Promotion Board with some fanfare cleared 8 new proposals in mid-July. The appointment of economist Raghuram Rajan as new Governor of the Reserve Bank of India, India’s central bank, normally an event confined to the fine print on the financial pages, was greeted with a full-court media press. Rajan’s initial statements emphasized the importance of growth – and of patience. He is evidently betting on the long term, and willing to take some short term heat, as witnessed by his September 20 hike in the bank’s key interest rate. However, elections loom before May 2014. The government has turned inward; populist issues top its legislative agenda. The Food Security bill, passed during the last session of parliament, will extend food entitlement programs to up to 50 percent of the urban population and up to 75 percent of the rural population. The Land Acquisition, Resettlement and Rehabilitation Act, also passed during the last session, updates the often troublesome process of land acquisition. Legal experts familiar with the process expressed hope that the enhanced compensation levels it enacts will reduce the frequency of protracted litigation over land acquisition. Business observers fear that the requirement for administrative review of the social impact of each land transaction in which the government is involved will lead to even further delays on the creation of new industrial establishments. And the impending election has slowed progress toward the unification of India’s tax system through a nation-wide Goods and Services Tax – ironically, because the major parties agree that it would be beneficial, but the opposition does not want to give the current Congress-led government a chance to look good. The impact of these developments goes beyond the domestic scene. For the past twenty years, **India has enjoyed** and nurtured **a global role that** goes **starts with primacy in its own neighborhood but also** features **a dynamic** new **relationship with the U**nited **S**tates, expanded trade as well as **strategic competition with China**, a growing role in Asian security extending from the Indian Ocean through to the Pacific, **and** a growing network of **economic agreements**, including Free Trade Agreements already concluded with Japan, Korea and ASEAN and pacts under negotiation with the EU and Canada. **India has** also **built up** its **ties with** the **BRICS countries** – Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa. **Each of these relationships is driven in significant part by India’s economic profile**. In each of these arenas, India’s economic slowdown will act as a drag on its strategic objectives. Take the strategic competition with China: India grew more slowly than China even during the boom years, and the present slump coincides with some speed bumps in China’s economic advancement. Nonetheless, India’s lackluster economic performance suggests that the time when India might move into the same economic league as China is not getting closer. Deepening economic engagement with Southeast and East Asia will continue – and India is fortunate to have concluded most of its trade agreements in that region before pre-election distraction set in. But security engagement to India’s east will depend in part on the budget, and at the moment, austerity is holding planned defense increases below the rate of inflation. The economic question marks that hang over some of BRICS’s more ambitious goals are bound to be intensified by India’s economic doldrums. The clearest example is the proposed BRICS development bank: unless India’s economic surge resumes, it becomes almost impossible to imagine such a bank having sufficient capital to make a difference unless its financing is turned over to China, a decision that India would probably be reluctant to accept. **India’s economic slowdown** and pre-election introspection **has probably had its most serious impact on ties with the U**nited **S**tates. **Economics were the starting point for the expanded U.S.-India relationship, and economic** and commercial **issues have an unusually large impact on a country’s profile in Washington**. In the five years since the global financial crisis started, the U.S.-India bilateral economic agenda has made relatively little progress. Long-standing issues important to U.S. business, such as the cap on foreign investment in insurance, have stalled. Recent Indian legislation, especially on land acquisition, has raised hackles among prospective investors. Compulsory licenses for pharmaceuticals in 2012 and 2013 may, as India argues, be consistent with India’s intellectual property laws and its agreements with the United States, but American businesses that went through the IP dispute in earlier years wonder whether India is moving back toward its former policy that basically disallowed foreign patents. The result is an extraordinarily sour mood among senior U.S. officials concerned with economic ties with India.

US-India relations are key to avoid nuclear war. India’s economic position is a key foundation of relations.

Schaffer 02 Spring 2002, Building a new partnership with India, Teresita Schaffer—Director of the South Asia Program at the Center for Strategic and International Security, Washington Quarterly, Lexis

**Washington's increased interest in India** since the late 1990s **reflects India's economic** expansion and **position** as Asia's newest rising power. New Delhi, for its part, is adjusting to the end of the Cold War. As a result, **both** giant **democracies** see that they **can benefit by closer cooperation**. For Washington, **the advantages include** a wider network of friends in Asia at a time when the region is changing rapidly, as well as **a stronger position from which to help calm possible future nuclear tensions in the region. Enhanced trade** and investment **benefit both countries and are a prerequisite for improved U.S. relations with India**. For India, the country's ambition to assume a stronger leadership role in the world and to maintain an economy that lifts its people out of poverty depends critically on good relations with the United States.

US India relations solves terrorism, WMDs, and general conflict in Asia.

**Burns 5** Burns, Nicholas. Under Secretary for Political Affairs. “The U.S. and India: An Emerging Entente?” Congressional Testimony before the House International Relations Committee. 8 September 2005. http://www.nti.org/e\_research/official\_docs/dos/dos090805.pdf

A strong democratic India is an important partner for the United States. We anticipate that **India will play an** increasingly **important leadership role in 21st century Asia, working with us to promote democracy, economic growth, stability and peace** in that vital region. By cooperating with India now, we accelerate the arrival of the benefits that India's rise brings to the region and the world. By fostering ever-closer bilateral ties, we also eliminate any possibility that our two nations might overlook their natural affinities and enter into another period of unproductive estrangement, as was so often the case in the past half century**.** Today, for the first time since bilateral relations were established in 1947, the United States and India are bound together by a strong congruence of interests, values, and a large and successful Indian-American community. Consequently we find an especially receptive partner in New Delhi, one no longer bound by Cold War politics or dogma. The **India**n Government **has demonstrated its firm desire to enhance our bilateral relationship. The United States now has a window of opportunity** to seize the initiative with India, **to build bonds** and habits **of cooperation that will stand the test of time. It is incumbent upon us, therefore, to** undertake ambitious actions that **correct our mutual history with India** of missed opportunities **and advance our common interests in the century ahead. We seek to work with India to win the** global **War on Terror**ism**, prevent the spread of w**eapons of **m**ass **d**estruction, **enhance peace and stability in Asia, protect trade routes and sea lines of communication, and** advance the **spread** of **democracy. India and the United States now find ourselves on the same side on all of these critical** strategic **objectives.** Our challenge, then, is to translate our converging interests into shared goals and compatible strategies designed to achieve those aims. In this context, the wide range of initiatives agreed to by President Bush and Prime Minister Manmohan Singh this July, including our agreement to promote civilian nuclear energy cooperation, represents a unique chance to build trust between the United States and India because of the resonance all these programs have for both countries.

### 3-Employment DA

Asia Floor Wage increases unemployment. Unemployment is the biggest problem for the poor in Asian countries.

**Clothesource 13** Clothesource. “Is the Living Wage movement economically feasible?” June 18th, 2013. http://clothesource.net/opinion/is-the-living-wage-movement-economically-feasible/

**Practically all businesses agree that the developing world’s biggest problem is underemployment**, and the job of the **garment industry** is to bring decent jobs. Those jobs **will migrate only if workers are paid substantially less than** they’d be paid **in the West**: but will attract workers only if they pay better than local alternatives (which are usually staying as subsistence peasants). So Nike, H&M et al promise to use only factories paying at least the national minimum wage, but attempt to cajole factory owners into productivity programmes to make sure workers actually make more. -          Most activists reject that view. Pointing out that wages calculated that way still sound derisory to a Western ear, they argue that workers should be paid a Living Wage, and there are a number of formulae invented to calculate what that should be. The best known example is **the Asia Floor Wage Campaign** – which **pitches for wages in South Asia not far short of those paid around the Southern Mediterranean**, a few days’ drive by truck from buyers’ warehouses near Frankfurt or London The Asia Floor Wage campaign is run emotively, with lots of phrases describing what it is like to be poorly paid in a poor country. Discussion of the underlying principles is rare: but behind all the complications, the issue comes down to one basic question: **If Asian workers got the same wages as Romanians, why would a**ny **European buyer commission clothes from Asia?** And if Romanians got the same wages as Germans, why would anyone commission clothes from Romania? **H&M don’t commission** their **clothes from Bangladesh out of** any **loyalty to Bangladesh**: if clothes cost as much in Bangladesh as in Germany, they’d be getting their clothes made next door to where those clothes are going to be sold. So what does happen if you pay workers in a poor country? That’s what the **Knight’s Apparel programme at Alta Gracia** helps us see. Knight’s Apparel, a privately held company that is no. 2 in America’s $4 bn collegiate wear market to Nike, bought in 2010 a factory closed three years earlier by its Korean cap-making owners.  CEO Joseph Bozich says that when he “stopped being defensive and listened” to students buying his products, “ I heard them saying we want to and do take pride in our university and we want to buy apparel that bears the logo, but we also want to take pride in the conditions under which it has been made” He now **pays well over the Dominican minimum wage**: in 2011, average monthly wages at Alta Gracia, including the 38% of wages paid into benefits programmes, averaged $759 a month, or 340% of the country’s minimum. The factory is “is run with strong employee input and relies on outside monitors to certify factory conditions”: it employs 130 people, publicity for the project claims that garments branded Alta Garcia sell at about the same prices as Nike or Adidas (which means higher than conventional private labels) and has been heavily promoted to college stores both through PR and through activist lobbying and demonstrations. Productivity appears relatively high, but studies by Georgetown University, if their numbers are analysed any further than their topline “it’s a great idea” summary, show complicated results. **After the first year, orders for Alta Gracia from** the **colleges** lecturing the garment industry about fair wages **remained disappointingly low**. Knights moved some production to it from  other factories (it does not publish supplier lists, but sources from subcontractors in Bangladesh, Egypt, Greater China and around Central America), which was not subsequently sold at the relative premium Knights achieved for its Alta Gracia product – but **the factory** still  **achieved only 80% use of available capacity**. Now, three years after the programme started, Bozich says **the factory loses money**, with lower profit margins on each item **because of the higher wage** and other costs, **and low** overall **demand**. But he remains confident. Universities, however, call the programme successful, because shops in colleges return roughly the same amount per square foot of space allocated to Alta Gracia product as to apparel overall: Knight’s lose money on it because the colleges do not allocate enough square footage to give Knights a return, because in turn the colleges see no evidence students are interested enough in the Alta Gracia proposition to put their money where their signatures on e-petitions are. Meanwhile, Knights – bizarrely – has moved jobs out of factories in the world’s poorest countries to support the Alta Gracia experiment. Bozich appears unfazed by his losses, and the Alta Gracia programme might reasonably be expected to see higher customer demand as a result of the current wave of scandals.  But **studies** so far **show no convincing evidence that even in** the **institutions demanding “fair”** as opposed to “legally mandated” **wages there is enough real interest among buyers to make the programme sustainable**. Nor has it shown any evidence, even in university shops actually operated by the universities, that colleges are any more prepared to sacrifice revenue to fund their football teams than real retailers are to fund their shareholders’ pensions. **I’m sceptical about** campaigns like **the Asian Floor Wage**  – not least because such campaigns are most enthusiastically supported by people in countries (like Sri Lanka) likely to improve their competitiveness if wages elsewhere (Cambodia, say, or Burma) shot up.  And the first three years of Alta Garcia make me more sceptical.

Living wage for sweatshop labor pushes factories out of poor countries. This turns poverty

**Kristof 9** Nicholas Kristof (raised a TOC elimination round participant, American journalist, author, op-ed columnist, and a winner of two Pulitzer Prizes). “Where Sweatshops Are a Dream.” New York Times. January 14th, 2009. http://www.nytimes.com/2009/01/15/opinion/15kristof.html?\_r=0

Mr. Obama and the Democrats who favor labor standards in trade agreements mean well, for they intend to fight back at oppressive sweatshops abroad. But while it shocks Americans to hear it, **the** central **challenge in** the **poor**est **countries is not that sweatshops exploit** too many people**, but that they don’t exploit enough**. Talk to these families in the dump, and a job in **a sweatshop is** a cherished dream, **an escalator out of poverty**, the kind of gauzy if probably unrealistic ambition that parents everywhere often have for their children. “I’d love to get a job in a factory,” said Pim Srey Rath, a 19-year-old woman scavenging for plastic. “At least that work is in the shade. Here is where it’s hot.” Another woman, Vath Sam Oeun, hopes her 10-year-old boy, scavenging beside her, grows up to get a factory job, partly because she has seen other children run over by garbage trucks. Her boy has never been to a doctor or a dentist, and last bathed when he was 2, so a sweatshop job by comparison would be far more pleasant and less dangerous. I’m glad that many Americans are repulsed by the idea of importing products made by barely paid, barely legal workers in dangerous factories. Yet sweatshops are only a symptom of poverty, not a cause, and banning them closes off one route out of poverty. At a time of tremendous economic distress and protectionist pressures, there’s a special danger that tighter labor standards will be used as an excuse to curb trade. When I defend sweatshops, people always ask me: But would you want to work in a sweatshop? No, of course not. But I would want even less to pull a rickshaw. **In the hierarchy of jobs in poor countries, sweltering at a sewing machine isn’t the bottom**. My views on sweatshops are shaped by years living in East Asia, watching as living standards soared — including those in my wife’s ancestral village in southern China — because of sweatshop jobs. Manufacturing is one sector that can provide millions of jobs. Yet **sweatshops usually go** not to the poorest nations but **to better-off countries with** more **reliable electricity and ports**. I often hear the argument: Labor standards can improve wages and working conditions, without greatly affecting the eventual retail cost of goods. That’s true. But labor standards and **“living wages” have a larger impact on production costs that companies are** always **trying to pare. The result is to push companies to operate** more **capital-intensive factories in better-off nations** like Malaysia, rather than labor-intensive factories in poorer countries like Ghana or Cambodia. Cambodia has, in fact, pursued an interesting experiment by working with factories to establish decent labor standards and wages. It’s a worthwhile idea, but **one result of paying above-market wages is that those in charge of hiring often demand bribes** — sometimes a month’s salary — **in exchange for a job**. In addition, these standards add to production costs, so some factories have closed because of the global economic crisis and the difficulty of competing internationally.

Unemployment outweighs your poverty offense:

1. Magnitude-sweatshops are the best alternative to rural poverty.

**Blacksburg 14** Adam Blacksburg. “In Defense of Sweatshops and Child Labor: A Response to the “Sweat Free” Activists.” The Humane Condition. April 17th, 2014. http://thehumanecondition.com/2014/04/17/sweatshopswillshanahan/

**When a person voluntarily chooses** to **work in a sweatshop**, it is because **that person views that option as their best choice among alternatives**. This is a truth known a priori, and it is based on the fact that they chose to do so. This a priori theory is confirmed with empirical data from real world analysis. Oxford University published economist Benjamin Powell’s book, Out of Poverty: Sweatshops in the Global Economy, last month. Dr. Powell devoted an entire chapter to the alternative jobs that sweatshop workers would have if they lost their jobs in the sweatshops. He found that “**in countries where sweatshops tend to be located large portions** of the population **work in agriculture**.”(2) Furthermore, these agricultural workers tend to be subsistence farmers. In the poorest of these countries, other alternatives include prostitution and sifting through garbage dumps. How do these alternatives compare to sweatshop labor? In Bangladesh, over 80% of the population live with a daily income under $2 a day. In India, it’s 60% of the population. For China, just over half the population earns under $2 a day. The average daily income of a sweatshop worker in Bangladesh is just over $2. For the Chinese sweatshop worker, it’s over $4 a day. The average Indian sweatshop worker earns $8 a day.(3) There’s a reason that people choose to work in sweat shops. As Paul Krugman noted in his article, aptly titled “In Praise of Cheap Labor: Bad Jobs at Bad Wages Are Better than No Jobs at All,” “while **wages** and working conditions **in** the new **export industries of the Third World** are appalling, they **are a big improvement over** the previous, less visible **rural poverty**.”(4) **These countries are** countries **with little capital. Thus, these countries are** countries **with little productivity. Wages rise as productivity rises**. But the productivity must rise first. The relationship between productivity and pay has been demonstrated countless times. But let’s look at the productivity of sweatshop labor and the productivity of subsistence farming. In Bangladesh, agriculture only accounts for 23% of the GDP, even though 58% of Bangladeshis are employed in agriculture. In China, almost half the population is employed in agriculture, yet agriculture only accounts for around 13% of the GDP.(5) There is a reason why sweatshop labor gets paid, on average, higher than the alternatives. **Sweatshops are more productive** and employ more capital **than the agricultural alternatives. As more people invest in these companies, wages will rise**. However, **legally raising** the **wages** of these workers higher than the value they produce **will not result in higher productivity. It will result in unemployment. Productivity must rise before wages rise**. Wages respond to productivity but productivity does not respond to artificially mandated wages.

1. Probability-best empirics flow neg.

Powell and Zwolinski 11 Benjamin Powell (director of the Free Market Institute at the Rawls College of Business at Texas Tech University) and Matt Zwolinski (Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of San Diego, and co-director of USD's Institute for Law and Philosophy). “The Ethical and Economic Case Against Sweatshop Labor: A Critical Assessment.” Journal of Business Ethics. September 2011. http://www.benjaminwpowell.com/scholarly-publications/journal-articles/powell-and-zwolinski-the-ethical-and-economic-case-against-sweatshop-labor.pdf

**A** more recent empirical **study** of the effect of actually mandating increases in the minimum wage casts serious doubt on Pollin et al.’s predictions. Harrison and Scorse examine the effect of increasing the minimum wage in **Indonesia** and **found** the **unemployment** impact that eco- nomic theory predicts. **In response** **to anti-sweatshop activism** and the US government’s threat to remove special tariff privileges if human rights issues were not addressed, the **Indonesia**n government **made increasing the minimum wage a central component of its labor market policies in the 1990s**. **The real value of the minimum wage more than doubled between** 19**89 and** 19**96.** What happened to manufacturing employment? **Harrison and Scorse estimate**d **that a 100 percentage point increase in Indonesia’s mini- mum wage was associated with a decrease in employment between 12 and 36%.** They also found that **wage increases led to plant closures** among small exporters. They conclude that ‘‘the significant negative impact on employment needs to be seriously considered in any campaign to increase the mandated minimum wage or to increase compliance with the minimum wages.’’39 The magnitude of unemployment effects varies with context. In some cases, consumer demand for ethically produced products may shift out to compensate for increased labor costs, but there is no reason to expect this condition to be universal. The section on ‘‘Legal Regula- tion, Industry Codes, and Company Policies’’ considers the scope for ethically branded niche products compared with across the board wage mandates. For now, it is enough to note that **the best available empirical evidence indicates that large across the board minimum wage mandates unemploy a significant number of workers.**

### 4-Labeling CP

Counterplan: The actors of the aff should require all factories to disclose details of their full supply chain to consumers and invest in monitoring conditions of all stages of the supply chain.

The counterplan enables consumers to buy products made in good working conditions while avoiding disads to a minimum wage increase

**Sanders et al 13** Piers Sanders, Vanina El-Khoury, David Faye, Cui Hailiang and Samsoo Oh (Cambridge Judge Business School). “How ‘fair trade’ could tackle sweatshops.” The Guardian. May 16th, 2013. http://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/may/16/fair-trade-combat-sweatshops

**An international minimum wage**, whether based on a percentage of the median country wage or on a rate set by international committees, **could be destructive to emerging economies** (A way to start healing the huge wound that Savar left, 13 May). Not only would such an initiative be costly to administer, but **increased costs** resulting from a higher minimum wage, and the corresponding incentive among producers to lower costs through automation, **would reduce overall demand for labour** in emerging economies. Not surprisingly, in the context of prevailing macroeconomic conditions and pent-up demand for low-cost production, **the prospect of black market sweatshops becomes all too real**. The problem could be addressed at the other end of the supply chain. Western **retailers should be required to display details of their full supply chain** to consumers **and invest in monitoring conditions** at all stages. The **"fair trade"** concept **could** then **be applied** to all types of industries**, allowing consumers the choice of paying a small premium on products produced in acceptable working conditions.**

All theory interps about what constitutes a legitimate negative advocacy must be in the 1AC. A. Stratskew. Otherwise you get bidirectional theory interps which makes it impossible to negate because I’m always subject to theory. B. Clash. If the interp is in the 1AC I get a chance to meet it so we can have a real substantive debate. Key to education—ensures we’re learning about the topic. C. Resolvability. Even if I don’t want to conform to your interp, three speech theory debates ensure the round is irresolvable because 1. There’s no 3nr for the neg to respond to new 2AR responses and weighing and 2. Blippy theory debates encourage judge intervention, both of which kill fairness.

### 5-Theory of the Good

A. if debaters defend consequentialism, they must specify a theory of the good by reading specific framework arguments that delineate what is to be promoted, maximized, or minimized. To clarify, the aff may not warrant consequentialism without explicitly contextualizing what consequences mean with a text in the 1AC. Examples of fair standards under my interpretation are “minimizing existential risk” or “maximizing life.”

B.

C. Stratskew. Consequentialism is an incredibly broad ethical theory that encompasses numerous subtheories-it says the rightness of the action is determined by the states of affairs it produces and nothing more—to make it an actual ethical theory there has to be a good to promoted, such as pleasure or life.

Haines William (The University of Hong Kong, China.) “Consequentialism” Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy RP 2/1/14

Consequentialism is the view that morality is all about producing the right kinds of overall consequences. Here the phrase “overall consequences” of an action means everything the action brings about, including the action itself. For example, if you think that the whole point of morality is (a) to spread happiness and relieve suffering, or (b) to create as much freedom as possible in the world, or (c) to promote the survival of our species, then you accept consequentialism. Although those three views disagree about which kinds of consequences matter, they agree that consequences are all that matters. So, they agree that consequentialism is true. The utilitarianism of John Stuart Mill and Jeremy Bentham is a well known example of consequentialism. By contrast, the deontological theories of John Locke and Immanuel Kant are nonconsequentialist.

Two impacts. A. Stable ground. They can shift around in their next speech saying my turns don’t link to a specific form of the good excluding all my offense arbitrarily—kills fairness because I can never link offense into their standard—cutting my strategy in half because I can only go for framework. B. Resolvability. This kills resolvability because we don’t know what offense actually functions under your standard so there’s no way to evaluate anything underneath it. Worst violation of fairness because the round isn’t determined by who did the better debating because the real debate is impossible to resolve.

D. Voters. Cross apply the voters in the aff.

Drop the debater 1. To rectify time lost running theory and 2. To deter future abuse—empirically proven by shells like a prioris bad. 3. Drop the arg skews my strat since debaters will read lots of unfair args in the AC and force me to waste time with lots of theory killing substantive education.

Competing interps since 1. Any brightline is arbitrary and bites judge intervention 2. Reasonability causes a race to the bottom to see who can be the most abusive under the given brightline 3. Competing interps forces a race to the top-an offense defense paradigm fosters good norms for the activity.

## Case

### ROTB-Policy

The role of the ballot is to vote to endorse the best postfiat policy option related to the resolution. Policy discussion is best for improving our decision making skills-the problems facing public policymakers are a magnitude greater than private decisions. We all know plans don’t actually happen, but practicing imagining the consequences of our decisions in the high-stakes games of public policymaking makes other decision-making easier. Real world decision making comes first. A. Probability-no one has ever actually stopped structural violence by reading a role of the ballot in the aff but we garner out of round benefits all the time using mine B. severity-its more useful in the real world since we have to make decisions literally all the time but only have to deal with structural violence a limited few times. C. This also turns your impacts since if we learn how to make decisions we’ll be good at challenging violence in the world since we’ll be good at dealing with lots of situations.

# 2NR

### A2 Solvency Advocate Theory

1. I meet-I advocate the solvency of my counterplan. Trust me its *really* good. I’m also qualified since I got a B+ in history this semester. Prefer text of the interp since A. otherwise they can shift around their abuse story in the next speech and delink all my offense which is the worst harm to fairness B. competing interps requires it since people in other rounds won’t know the specific things that applied to this round only.

2. Counter interp: on the jan feb 2015 topic the neg does not need a solvency advocate for a counterplan. I meet. Prefer:

Advocacy skills-if I don’t have an advocate describing the cp for me, then I have to provide all the reasons why it’s a good policy option myself. I become the advocate instead of needing to find one. Key to education since they’re directly applicable, they teach us to be informed citizens who can formulate and defend a position; necessary for job interviews, if we become policymakers, lawyers, etc. Even if we don’t all go into these professions, they best correspond with the things debate teaches us, meaning I allow for an advantage in a more relevant area which means its key to education.